


by a bump or tab 26 connected to each of the rails 18, as indicated in Figure 2.

A question also came up with respect to whether or not a double patenting rejection was appropriate over the parent application. As set forth in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, a double patenting rejection would not be appropriate between a parent and a divisional application. See M.P.E.P. 804.01 which prohibits a double patenting rejection after a restriction requirement, particularly where the restriction was based on combinations and subcombinations (as it was in the case of the restriction requirement set forth in the parent patent application, serial number 08/978,397 (Paper No. 2)). Thus, it is not believed that a double patenting rejection could now be put forward since this is precluded under the restriction/double patenting practice.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/17/00

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop  
Registration No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024-1805  
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]  
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]